The Shakespeare Newsletter

Vol. X, No. 4 - 5 "Knowing I lov'd my books, he furnish'd me . . ." Sept. - Nov., 1960

SHAKESPEARE TRIUMPHS IN SUMMER FESTIVALS

Shakespeare Festival, Akron

What started off as a one play event in 1958 with Macbeth and in 1959 with Romeo and Juliet, has in 1960 blossomed out into a five week repertory as the Shakespeare-under-the-Stars Shakespeare Festival at Stan Hywet Hall in Akron, Ohio.

With Arthur Lithow who produced the Antioch College Area Theatre Shakespeare Festival for five years as Executive Director and director of 2 Henry IV, was Edward Payson Call who directed Richard II, Henry IV, and Henry V. The season ran from July 3 to August 6 and was so popular at the end that the addition of a week or two was seriously considered. By the end of the five week season a total of 11,639 spectators saw the tetralogy.

An effective cast gave life to the series and made the less frequently acted plays credible to an audience—many of whom purchased tickets for all four plays. One play was introduced each week so that by the fifth week it was possible to see each of the plays successively.

Henry Hewes of Saturday Review attended the premiere performance of Richard II and wrote that "All in all, this is an astonishingly good production.

The plays are acted on a stage designed by Bud Steinhilber (designer of the Antioch stage) on the terrace of Stan Hywet Hall, a beautiful Tudor mansion built by the Seiberling family of rubber tire fame.

San Diego National Festival

The program of Hamlet, As You Like It, and Julius Caesar presented at the 11th National Shakespeare Festival as the Old Globe Theatre in San Diego, California, proved tremendously successful and entertained about 27,000 during its nine week season from July 5 through September 4. The little 400-seat theatre averaged an attendance of 95% for the season with many tourists and students attending the performances. Newspapers in the area acclaimed the Festival for its high standard of excellence. William Ball directed JC and Allan Fletcher the remaining plays. The professional repertory company was augmented by the addition of other actors selected on a scholarship basis.

The "Old Globe Theatre" left over from 1935 centennial exhibition has been the scene of ten previous festival seasons during which there have been 387 performances of 23 Shakespearean plays attended by 131,105 theatre-goers.

Stratford, Canada

Stratford, Canada's eighth Shakespearean Festival attained new stature and broke new records with its productions of A Midsummer Night's Dream, Romeo and Juliet, and King John.

Brooks Atkinson of The New York Times has called the company "the finest group of classical actors in North America," and this season "from every point of view . . . is its finest." (July 3, Drama Section)

From the prologue spoken by a character garbed in our conventional picture of Dante to the final scene where the hands of the lovers are clasped in death—symbolically inseparable, Romeo & Juliet—with Julie Harris as its star-moves on in various tempos, often too loud as at the seeming death of Juliet. Probably for symbolic reasons, the Prince always appears on the upper stage, but it makes one wonder about the street levels of Verona.

Critics found the Dream enjoyable and full of excitement. Atkinson also found too little poetry and wondered would it be possible to have movement AND poetry rather than only the former.

King John surprised the critics who found Douglas Seale's direction admirable and the cast equally effective. The play is not a dull one, though lesser directors think it a minor work and accordingly slight it. In the nineteenth century attempts were made o enliven it by staging the signing of the Magna Carta which Shakespeare slighted.

During the final week of the season over 18,000 high school students from southern Canada and the nearby U. S. attended eight performances of Romeo and Juliet.

New York City

Joseph Papp's fifth season of free Shakespeare in the City of New York presented fine performances of Henry V, Measure for Measure, and The Taming of the Shrew to thousands of New Yorkers at the rate of 2000 per night from June 29 to early in September.

Arthur Gelb of The New York Times found the company rich in everything but money—and declared that the Shakespeare the people get free is "a lot more than many producers are selling on Broadway for as much as $9.90 a ticket." (June 30)

At the Belvedere Lake theatre—soon to be made permanent by virtue of civic funds—the plays are presented on the now usual Elizabethan type apron stage. By virtue of well concealed microphones the large audience is enabled to hear everything.

Joseph Papp himself directed King John and added a new twist by casting the Williams who challenges Henry in the camp scene as a Negro, thus giving contemporary significance to the scene. Measure for Measure was directed by Alan Schneider in such a way that Lewis Funke of the Times found it an "absorbing and riveting" play well worth the production.

The Taming of the Shrew was directed by Gerald Freedman in the hilarious manner now common with this play. We liked the play but found it a little more farcical than Shakespeare may have intended it especially in the scene where Petruchio brings his new bride to his home.

Perhaps any free drama would attract equally enthusiastic audiences, but the "Shakespeare spells ruin" philosophers on Broadway may well wonder at the drawing power of the Bard and ponder the reasons for their own failures within the last ten years on the "hit" or bust stage economy on which they operate.

Stratford, Connecticut

The sixth annual American Shakespeare Festival at Stratford, Connecticut, ended on September 11 breaking all previous records with an approximate gross gate of $640,000 and an attendance of over 200,000 playgoers.

Says Jack Landau Associate Producer: "Since I live in 1960, my great aim is to make these plays as immediate, human and understandable as possible to a modern audience. The great thing about Shakespeare is that he's talking about human experience all the time, and human experience doesn't alter much from century to century."

The Tempest and Antony and Cleopatra were conventionally staged, but Twelfth Night was set in an early nineteenth century seaside resort. Brooks Atkinson found the humor less effective when transposed to the new period. He also found the acting less effective than the costumes and scenery. Katherine Hepburn did not "glow from within." Malvolio was "neatly insufferable" as he should have been. In general Atkinson found a shining surface but a lack of "gaiety and romance."

Antony and Cleopatra is symbolically set with an abstract metal arch to portray Rome, a single sail to suggest Pompey's ship, and rather solid monument for the final scene. We found Cleopatra more sexy and temperamental than queenly making us wonder whether the world was well lost after all.

The Tempest with Morris Carnovsky as Prospero was distinguished—the first time we ever saw it that way—by the opening storm scene omitted a grievous loss. Some of the great opulence of the marriage masque might have been reduced and the storm scene well included.

The venetian blind slats used for the scenery in the past years have been replaced by an engulfing shell of petal-like shapes, more effective in the fairy Tempest than in Antony and Cleopatra.

The Festival Company is currently on a coast-to-coast tour with The Winter's Tale and A Midsummer Night's Dream. Bert Lahr is starring as Bottom and Autolycus. Boston, Baltimore, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Dallas, St. Louis, and other cities are on the itinerary.

Oregon Festival

In its 20th season, the Oregon Shakespeare Festival at Ashland, Oregon, broke all its previous records by entertaining 42,978 persons during its 41 day run from July 25 to September 3. A total of 19 sell-outs with scores turned away produced an average 91.7% average attendance for the season. The order in which the plays ran on successive nights—Shrew, Julius Caesar, Tempest, and RII—was also the final order of their relative popularity. Over 12,000 saw the Shrew and over 8000 saw RII.

An innovation this year was the introduction of a non-Shakespearean play, John Webster's The Duchess of Malfi, which attracted over 2000 for its two showings.

The 1959 attendance was 36,593, 17% less than for the current year. The re-designed theatre completed in 1959 seats 1143 spectators. As many as 150 standing room tickets were sold for one performance of the Shrew.

To make the four day-four play stay at Ashland as entertaining as possible, a series of lectures, courses, exhibits, tours, foreign films, and concerts was made available.

The plays were directed respectively by Robert Loper, Jerry Turner, James Sandoe (The Duchess also), and Richard Risso.

APOLOGIES FROM EDITOR

My apologies for the lateness of the issue. I had promised Lippincott that I would finish my History of Shakespeare's Reputation by October 31, and I did!

MERCHANT OF VENGEANCE

There has been a great deal of controversy over the character of Shylock in The Merchant of Venice since the beginning of the eighteenth century. Nicholas Rowe in the first 18th century edition of the poet protested against the comic Shylock's then being performed. When Charles Macklin in 1741 restored the tragic monster Alexander Pope was moved to remark that this was the Jew that Shakespeare drew. In 1796 Richard Hole apologized for the "Character and Conduct of Shylock," remarked about the indignities to which Shylock had been subjected, and wondered what would have been the situation had the tables been turned. Shylock indeed does declare that he will get revenge by Christian example.

If I understand my friend Dr. Toby Lelyveld's Columbia University dissertation correctly, she attributes some of the change in the interpretation of Shylock on the stage to the prestige of Benjamin Disraeli, Victoria's empire builder. Though not a practicing Jew, his background was unmistakeable. When Henry Irving's production of **The Merchant of Venice** opened on November 1, 1879, Disraeli had been in office since 1874. The production ran a record breaking 250 performances,—and part of the success was attributable to the fact that Irving aroused a great deal of sympathy for "the bloody-minded monster" as he called him. The play is as credible in this form as any other. There is no need for the suicide of Shylock of Richard Mansfield's New York production in 1893, nor is there need to elicit tears for the character as Clarence Derwent did. The play is interesting for the many interpretations of the Jew. The romantic elements in the fifth act were often so jarring to producers that they ended the play after the exit of Shylock in despair.

Space here is too short to argue the merits of Shylock and the humanity of Shakespeare, but directors of the play ought at least to give Shylock a chance. On November 7th Players Incorporated came to Kent State University with their version of the play. Never had I seen a less human-looking Shylock. Makeup made Shylock almost black-bronze in appearance; his hair stood out black and stringy; his look was an almost continuous bloodthirsty leer. He has a slight trace of "Jewish" accent and in one place Solanio mimicked him when he reported Shylock raving about his "dotter" and his "dockets."

Players Incorporated is a fine company and travels widely; they are not the only ones to perform Shylock in this way. But they do cater as do other traveling companies—to what they frequently think is the low tastes of audiences on their itinerary. The Barter Theatre is also guilty and the experiences of readers may add other examples.

With such a philosophy of staging, everything that is not tragic is to be played for laughs. In this production too, the curtain rises to laughter when there should be melancholy at the sadness of Antonio. "Ho, hum," begins Antonio with a grimace. And Portia makes her entrance in the same way. The audience laughs, but . . . . ! Tubal is made a grovelling, fawning idiot who waddles almost bent in half and talks to Shylock by creeping up to him from the waist to his chin. The Prince of Arragon is made into a lip-smacking, broad lipped, eye-rolling Milton Berle type, and the Prince of Morocco is played as a dim witted moron who stamps and pouts because he doesn't win his love. Launcelot is indeed a clown, but he is a good servant and not the foolish, prancing character that he is made.

Let us have more and more touring companies. But let us have them perform credibly. Let us have clowns and fools that are not morons, let us not play everything for laughs. Let us present Shakespeare, not "produce" him.

L. M.

Trustees at Stratford-upon-Avon Issue Appeal for New Library Fund

Because of the international scope of the Library maintained in connection with the Birthplace at Stratford-upon-Avon, The Trustees of the Birthplace have decided to make their appeal for funds for the proposed new Library and Headquarters on a world wide scale. The Trustees earmarked $70,000 of their income for the project and are seeking an additional $210,000 from individuals, societies, philanthropic bodies, trusts, business organizations, colleges, schools, and other institutions throughout the world. Donors may consider their gift for the Library as a donation to international monument to the memory of the poet to be dedicated on April 23, 1964.

The new Library will house the 20,000 volumes comprising the joint collection of the Birthplace and the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre. Special provisions are being made to protect the many rare books, folios, quartos, original documents, and other unique items. There will also be a large seminar room, exhibition -hall study center, and offices for an administration headquarters.

Funds to maintain all the Birthplace properties are secured from admission charges only.

Those who wish to make donations—and any amount is acceptable—may make checks payable to The Shakespeare Birthplace Trust and send them to The Director, Shakespeare's Birthplace, Stratford-upon-Avon, England. A permanent register of all contributions will be preserved in the new Library. Subscribers of 250 pounds or over ($700) will have their names recorded on a plaque in the entrance hall.

The Library is at the disposal of bona fide scholars and students who have come from many countries throughout the world. No charge is made for access to the materials.

Champlain Festival

A history, comedy, and a tragedy were featured at the 2nd Annual Champlain Shakespeare Festival at the University of Vermont, Burlington, from August 1 to August 28. **The Taming of the Shrew, Henry IV, Pt. 1,** and **Macbeth** were directed by Gregory Falls who had a 1950 Fulbright scholarship to study drama in England and a 1954 University of Vermont grant to visit the Shakespeare festivals of America.

The plays were presented in a squared arena with the audience on three sides. The little theatre in the Fleming Museum seats only 237 spectators none of whom are more than twenty five feet from the acting area.

The first Festival, underwritten by students and friends, offered **Twelfth Night, A Midsummer Night's Dream,** and **Moliere's The Miser.** So successful was it that University funds were secured for the second venture.

An attendance of about 5,000 this year was an increase of about 2000 over 1959.

The company consisted of about thirty, half of whom were young paid professionals with exceptional ability.

FOLGER SHAKESPEARE LIBRARY MAKES PERMANENT LOAN OF FOUR FOLIOS

Four of the Shakespeare folios from the Folger Shakespeare Library were presented to Principal T. M. Knox for St. Andrews University in Scotland at a ceremony given by the Ambassador of the United States at his London residence on September 8. The presentation was made by Dr. Louis B. Wright, Director of the Library. Mr. Eustace Seligman Chairman of the Amherst College trustees who administer the Library said that the gift was a reminder of the bonds of "common literary tradition" between the nations. Dr. Wright announced that since the collation of the first folios by Dr. Charlton Hinman was now completed and that the revolutionary results would be published within a year, the collection made by Henry Clay Folger has been justified. Having served their purpose, Dr. Wright sought for an English university that did not possess a set and fixed on St. Andrews because of its close connection with American education during the colonial period. St. Andrews was first to recognize Ben Franklin's electrical discoveries—a fact which almost tempted him to emigrate to Scotland.

Dr. Wright believes that the work of Dr. Hinman is so thorough that it will never have to be done again. Thus the permanent loan is possible. His statement that the "Folger Library believes that the interests of learning can be served by placing a few of these Folios in other institutions," leads to the belief that similar bequests may be made to other institutions in the future.

The studies of Dr. Hinman—to be published by Oxford University Press—"will revolutionize previous ideas of how the First Folio was printed and will enable textual editors to make emendations with some sense of scientific accuracy," said Dr. Wright.

On October 27 the Library made a similar gift to the University of British Columbia. At the same time it was announced that there were no immediate plans for further loans. The Canadian library received the Folios on the occasion of the dedication of a new library at the University and because of the library's "growing significance in the humanistic education of the Pacific Northwest."

THE SHAKESPEARE NEWSLETTER
Published at Kent, Ohio
Editor and Publisher
LOUIS MARDER
Department of English
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
Kent Ohio
Six issues annually - Feb., April, May, Sept., Nov., Dec.
Annual Subscription $1.50
Entered as Second Class Matter at the Post Office, Kent, Ohio

Vol. X: No. 4 - 5 Sept. - Nov., 1960

Shakespeare in Japan

By Toshikazu Oyama, Seijo University, Tokyo. Japan

The history of the interest in Shakespeare in Japan is very old. Very little, however, is known abroad about it, since most of the studies and performances have been in Japanese and very few attempts have ever been made to introduce them abroad. Most universities in Japan have English departments and Shakespeare is, almost without exception, one of the required courses for English majors. There are many universities which have the annual performances of Shakespeare's plays in English. We also have an annual Shakespeare Festival under the auspices of the English Literary Society of Japan, and that is an occasion for lectures on Shakespeare and production of his plays. Among the ambitions of our professional players there has always been the desire to enact Shakespeare's popular plays in Japanese. The recent production of Othello with Koshiro Matsumoto, one of the leading Kabuki actors, as the protagonist, and Masayuki Mori, of Bungakuza troupe, as Iago, was a great success. It was broadcast on T. V. throughout the country. Other recent performances by professional troupes would include **Twelfth Night, Romeo and Juliet, Merry Wives of Windsor, Macbeth and Hamlet.** And it is still fresh in our memory that a movie called **Castle of Cobwebs**, the Japanese version of **Macbeth**, with characters and settings of the Japanese feudal age enjoyed a good house and a long run.

In producing Shakespeare's plays in Japanese, the greatest obstacle is, of course, how to transcribe and reproduce Shakespeare's poetry in Japanese. And the responsibility of the translators is very great. Many scholars and playwrights have attempted translations, and continue in these efforts. Sho-yo Tsubouchi, himself a great Kabuki playwright, is the only man who has completed a translation of the whole of Shakespeare's works. He was an eminent pioneer of Shakespeare activities in Japan and his translations, though slightly archaic in style, are still standard works. Tsuneari Fukuda, who directed the recent production of **Othello** using his own translation, is now preparing a new Japanese version of Shakespeare's complete works. Jiro Ozu has published translations of **Macbeth** and **Twelfth Night** which are exceptional in their modernity. Thus various attempts are made by many scholars and writers, but there seems to be much left to do in the future.

Editing Shakespeare has been the attempt of many Shakespeare scholars in Japan. Sanki Ichikawa, Professor Emeritus of Tokyo University, is the pioneer in this field. From 1921 to 1931 he published editions of **King Lear, Hamlet, Julius Caesar, The Tempest, Antony and Cleopatra, Macbeth, Othello, The Merchant of Venice, As You Like It, Henry IV, Romeo and Juliet, Midsummer Night's Dream** and **Richard II.** These editions with his own critical commentaries in English and Japanese, have been and are widely read in universities and greatly influence the Shakespeare studies in our country. Torajiro Sawamura edited several plays of Shakespeare with Japanese translation. Tosaku Tsuzuki's **Julius Caesar** (1931) and **Hamlet** (1932) are a sort of variorum editions. One of the most remarkable editions is **King Lear** by Takeshi Saito, Professor Emeritus of Tokyo University, which has its Japanese translation facing the identical English passages on the opposite page and his critical commentaries are in English and Japanece. Toshikazu and Toshiko Oyama are preparing their new edition of Shakespeare, and **Richard III, Twelfth Night, Hamlet, Antony and Cleopatra** and **Julius Caesar** have already been published.

There are a good many books and monographs on Shakespeare published in Japan. Sho-yo Tsubouchi's **An Introduction to the Studies of Shakespeare** and Takeshi Saito's **Studies of Shakespeare** are similar sorts of introductory works. Shintaro Nakanishi's **Preface to Shakespeare** treats the history of Shakespeare criticism; and Toshikazu Oyama's **An Approach to the Recent Shakespeare Studies** discusses the main tendencies of recent Shakespeare studies. Shunzo Kashiwakura's **Shakespeare and His Environment**, Kazuo Nakahashi's **Fate of Shakespeare's Fools**, Toshiko Oyama's **A Study of Shakespeare's Imagery** and Toshikazu Oyama's **Shakespeare's View of Man** are some of the recent literary studies. **Shakespeare** by Kenichi Yoshida is a book intended for general readers. Takanobu Otsuka's **English of Shakespeare and the Authorized Version** and Itsuki Hosoe's **Shakespeare's English** are the books which introduce one to Shakespeare's language. The translation of W. Franz's **Die Sprache Shakespeares** by Shizuka Saito and others was published two years ago. **A Study of Shakespeare's Handwriting** by Takanobu Otsuka is a scholarly research and also a good introduction to Shakespeare's handwriting. These books and monographs are all written in Japanese.

There are a great many articles on Shakespeare in magazines and bulletins. Almost every issue of the **Rising Generation**, the oldest monthly journal of English literature, includes articles on Shakespeare. **English Literary Studies**, the quarterly publication of the English Literary Society of Japan, also includes Shakespeare studies. In the magazines and bulletins published by various universities, Shakespeare is one of the most popular subjects of study, and many articles by young scholars attract our attention. The method of treating Shakespeare certainly has changed through the years, from the simple introductory essays of the past to the present bibliographical and highly specialized approaches. There are many articles written in English and through them we wish to show our earnest desire to join in the Shakespeare studies of the world.

Regarding the question of the earliest contact with Shakespeare, there are many scholars who conclude that we can find the earliest influence of Shakespeare in a play, **Kokoro no Nazo Toketa Iroito** (A Story of Tangled Love), performed in 1810. The actual influences, however, came with the Meija era. Robun Kanagaki adapted the story of **Hamlet**, and Mokuami Kawatake used the same material in about 1878. The complete translation of **Julius Caesar** by Keizo Kawashima appeared in 1883, and it may be said to have been the beginning of the new phase of Shakespeare activity in Japan. Sho-yo Tsubouchi's translation of the same play was published in 1884, and from that time on he was an active leader. Tsubouchi's own Kabuki play, **Kirihitoha** (A Leaf of Paulownia), known as the best play written in the Meija era, has many allusions to Shakespeare's plays.

The adaptation of Shakespeare on the stage began with the performance of **All for Money**, a Japanese version of **The Merchant of Venice**, in 1885, acted by Kabuki troup. In 1901, part of **Julius Caesar**, based on the translation by Tsubouchi, was performed. Other performances followed, and by that time Shakespeare's plays were a very important part of the repertory of the Japanese acting companies.

Shakespeare has been and will continue to be a subject of great interest in Japan and we hope to draw closer to the groups in other countries who do studies of this greatest of all playwrights.

A project in Scenic Design for Shakespeare's Macbeth at Antioch College. M. A. in Theatre Design. State University of Iowa.

By Whitney Leblanc (now at Antioch College)

This design project supports the writer's belief that a play can have more than one interpretation. It presupposes that as thearte artists, directors and scene designers have dramatic license to give an honest interpretation of the playwright's work.

In 1936 Orson Welles staged his own adaptation of **Macbeth** for the Federal Theatre Project. He made two major changes in his adaptation which was essentially the basis for his interpretation. He used Negro actors, and he enlarged the element of the super-natural by substituting voodoo for witchcraft. Everything else which was changed in the adaptation was done in support of, or subsequent to these two major changes. A close examination of the script shows that the plot and story follow the original. It is quite similar to the Welles production of **Macbeth** with the Mercury Theatre.

The setting is composed of a basically realistic interior of a palace and an impressionistic cut-out drop of the jungle formed by a huge false proscenium of jungle growth. The palace setting is mobile and interchangable with the jungle drop. Changes of locale in the jungle are made by adding of trees, vines, ground rows of distant objects and a smoking cauldron. Further away in the distant is the ever present cyclorama which receives the projections of the storm and lightning filled sky during the witch's scenes. The constant presence of the foliage proscenium gives unity to all scenes and creates a feeling within the audience that they are witnessing the dark events through a cut-out section of thick jungle growth.

A complete step by step process of the production from the beginning to the final design, and a detailed analysis and explanation of the Welles adaptation are included.

MACMILLAN PAPERBACKS

A new, high standard in quality paperback publishing . . . handsome, well-made volumes with clear print, generous margins . . . for your permanent library.

SHAKESPEARE'S THEATER
By Ashley Thorndike
"A notable contribution . . . It recreates, in the terms of the theater and with the stage as the center of the piece, one of the most vivid and absorbing periods that mode n history can boast." —The New York Times $2.45

THE MUSES' DARLING: CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE
By Charles Norman
"Just about as good a life of Marlowe as present knowledge permits . . . This is the book that I shall give to anyone whose mind I wish to turn toward Christopher Marlowe." —Ben Ray Redman $1.85

THE SCHOLAR ADVENTURERS
By Richard D. Altick
"An exciting record of modern literary research that no bookman will wish to do without." —Chicago Sunday Tribune $1.45

Write for complete descriptive brochure of MACMILLAN PAPERBACKS

The Macmillan Company
60 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 11, N. Y.

LANDMARKS OF CRITICISM

Edited by Edmund Creeth, University of Michigan

Preface to The Plays of William Shakespeare (1765)
Samuel Johnson

The great merit of Shakespeare is his fidelity to human life. Because of this he still gives pleasure and grows in fame after a century and a half. He does not exaggerate love. He has no heroes. Even amidst the wonderful, his characters behave according to human nature. This concern with the real behavior of men puts him above petty cavilers who find his Romans un-Roman (Dennis, Rhymer) or his kings unroyal (Voltaire). Imitating life's mixture of good and evil, joy and sorrow, high and low, Shakespeare alternates scenes of seriousness and mirth, yet without losing his hold upon us. He disregards the practice of the ancients and the rule against drama of the mingled kind, (of these his age knew little), "but there is always an appeal open from criticism to nature." While his tragic scenes seem labored, his comic scenes are always felicitous.

Faults he has—greater care to please than to instruct, carelessness in forming his plots and in avoiding anachronisms, grossness, infelicities of expression, disastrous inability to resist a quibble—but neglect of the unities is no longer to be counted among them. He observes sufficiently the unity of action. The supposed necessity of restricting time and place rests upon the false assumption that an audience imagines itself really transported to the place and age represented on the stage. He who truly imagines that the stage is the palace of the Ptolemies may later imagine that it is Actium. But in fact spectators are not so deluded. They know that they are watching successive imitations of real actions, and hence there is no absurdity in representing preparations for war at Rome and the outcome of that war at Pontus. Accustomed to contracting it in contemplation, we easily allow the contraction of time in the theatre. The emotional effect of feigned events comes from real possibilities which they call to mind, not from mistaking them for real events.

The rude audience for which he wrote demanded of Shakespeare fabulous situations, crowded plots, and an abundance of bustle and show. He had read widely in English, though probably not in Latin or the modern languages, but chiefly his excellence is the product of his own genius and power of observation. (Though the chronology of his works is unsettled, he must have matured with experience.) These made him, though he began in unfavorable circumstances, the first to teach either comedy or tragedy to please, as well as, perhaps along with Spenser, to bring harmony to the language.

Writing for immediate profit works which he thought unfit for posterity, Shakespeare took no interest in their publication. They existed in negligent and unskillful editions (the editor's art not having been applied to modern languages) until Rowe, who supplied a life and preface and made many corrections. Pope, who but half understood an editor's function, first demonstrated the corruptness of the text and collated old copies. Theobald, a mean and petulant editor, was next, followed by Sir Thomas Hanmer, sensitive and learned though uncritical of his predecessors. The precipitancy of some of the notes of Warburton, the latest editor, has exposed him to attack by lesser men.

This edition is indebted to all its predecessors and where they are confuted it is without pleasure or acrimony. The editor has collated where he could and admitted a minimum of conjectural emendations. "It has been my settled principle, that the reading of the ancient books is probably true." He preserves, without authority, the usual division into acts of plays written, first printed, and intended to be exhibited without such artificial interruption. He has tried to clear obscure passages with notes—necessary evils which ought not be allowed to distract the reader until he has appreciated the general effect of the work. Dryden, when the text was still unedited, perceived Shakespeare's "comprehensive soul" and knowledge of nature. "It is to be regretted that such a writer should want a commentary; that his language should become obsolete, or his sentiments obscure." But he has suffered more in this respect than any other writer since the introduction of printing by judging 'those works unworthy to be preserved, which the critics of following ages were to contend for the fame of restoring and explaining."

"The Brevity of Friar Lawrence"
Bertrand Evans, University of California
PMLA, LXV No. 5 (Sept. 1950), 841-65

The main sources of critical lamentation in R and J are what may be called the trespasses of Friar Laurence and Friar John. Laurence, it is felt, delays the final curtain by recapitulating what we already know. John is too conveniently prevented from delivering the vital message that Juliet is merely drugged—the graver offense since in it "the relentless logic of the play breaks down" (G. P. Baker) and Shakespeare fails to achieve true tragedy. Another view of the play, faithful to its actual tragic pattern, alters the appearance of these alleged faults.

The close of R and J is dominated by two facts: the bewilderment of the participants and the wide gap between it and our clear understanding of the situation. Even Laurence, who knows most, only partly understands what killed Romeo and Paris and Juliet. And before he speaks his knowledge the presence of Romeo and Paris dead and the warmth of Juliet's body, two days buried, are wholly inexplicable to the Prince, the families, and the citizens. Their bewilderment suggests the means by which Fate, Heaven, "the greater power than we can contradict," operates in R and J to end the feud by the lover's deaths. For it is not enough to say what the Prologue tells us, that Fate wrought the end. A tragic dramatist must show how Fate worked—not, in this play, through villainy, supernatural agency, or character, but through the actor's ignorance of the true nature of the situations in which they act. R and J is a tragedy of unawareness.

Tybalt, for example, adds a link to the chain by accusing Benvolio in the first scene (" . . . art thou drawn among these heartless hinds?" because, as Shakespeare constructs the scene, he can not know as we do Benvolio's worthy motive. Benvolio has truly said of the skirmishers, "You know not what you do." Sampson and Gregory, Abram and Balthasar mean no harm to the children of their masters' houses, but as the Prologue enables us to realize they contribute to the chain of causes leading to catastrophe, as do Rosaline and the illiterate servant who cause Romeo to attend the ball. While we remain omniscient because omnipresent, Fate proceeds more distinctly after the preliminary scenes to use the human condition of not knowing, and the narrow vision of the characters themselves becomes increasingly marked. In response to Romeo's query at the ball the servant significantly replies, "I know not," and at their first meeting Fate takes advantage of the lovers' ignorance of each other's identity. "Blind is his love," Mercutio later says, but he and Benvolio are blinder in their ignorance that Romeo has forgotten Rosaline. The indispensable condition when Fate first strikes (III,i) is not the mid-day heat but Mercutio's and Tybalt's unawareness that Romeo and Juliet are married. "Vile submission" is therefore Mercutio's judgment of Romeo, out of which comes death for himself and Tybalt. Similarly Capulet and Paris can be shown to perform blamelessly acts indispensable to the deaths of the lovers in that state of unawareness which governs all the key acts and judgments in the course of the tragic action.

Friar John's detention, however, lies outside the pattern: Romeo's suicide would have occurred had the incident of John been omitted altogether. "The indispensable stitch between Capulet's 'We'll to church tomorrow" and Romeo's suicide, which ends the pattern, is not the Friars failure to reach Mantua . . .but Balthasar's success." Without Balthasar ("I brought my master news of Juliet's death") Laurence could have taken Juliet safely to his cell till Romeo came. Unaware of what Balthasar has done, he fears nothing more than the breaking of his promise that Romeo should be present at her awakening.

Laurence's disputed recapitulation is essential because it permits us to watch while certain actors learn, though imperfectly, their parts in the catastrophe. The Prince can reassess his sentence of banishment. For Capulet are these words: " . . .not for Tybalt, Juliet pin'd." For Balthasar these: "Then gave I her . . . A sleeping potion . . . ." A more subtle justification of the speech stems from our contemplation of, its inadequacy to describe the close details of Fate's working. The five dead, participants and victims too, all of whom died unaware of the situation as it really was, cannot hear even this poor reconstruction. "Yet Rosaline, the thumb-biters, the illiterate servant, and Benvolio are presumably present at the last . . .as the Friar exposes such fragments as he possesses." His forty lines are insufficient to compel "any of these to glimpse the casual connection between themselves and the scene before them . . . ." Our knowledge is therefore unrelieved; " and the pain left with us marks our awareness of the brevity—the irremediable fact of the brevity—of Friar Laurence."

SHAKESPEARE

21 Play Edition, Revised

Hardin Craig

The text of twenty-one plays, with an unusually complete and authentic presentation of the life and times of Shakespeare. Illustrations and end-sheet maps of England and London have been added in this revision

1216 pages $7.25 list

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

Chicago Atlanta Dallas Palo Alto
Fair Lawn, N. J.

CURRENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Robert L. Tener, Assistant

Jones A. Barish, Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy, Cambridge, Harvard U.P., 1960. 335 pp. $5.00.

In analyzing the language of Ben Jonson's comedies Mr. Barish has concentrated on the patterns of prose that Jonson evolved in attempting to reproduce realistic, live speech. He discusses the plays in thier chronological order and makes frequent illuminating comparisons between Jonson and Shakespeare as well as other Stuart playwrights. A comparison between the opening prose speech from the first part of Henry IV and the opening speeches from Every Man out of his Humour and Poetaster, for example, suggests to Mr. Barish that "the rhythm of the Shakespearean passage is slower, fuller, more oratorical, that of the Jonsonian passages more abrupt, staccato, and sharp. And these differences can be quickly traced to the fact that Shakespeare is using not only longer phrases, but a more oratorical, more symmetrical syntax than Jonson." In the opening chapter, "Antecedents," there is presented an excellent discussion of the development of prose in comedies during the last half of the sixteenth century. Almost half of the chapter is devoted to an analysis of Shakespeare's prose. According to the author, Shakespeare "starts with the highly specialized set of expressive devices worked out by Lyly, inflects them with nuances, widens their range, and so finally transcends them, but without departing from the structural principles on which they are based." Many examples from Shakespeare's tragedies and late romances are included to support the contention that "logicality" is an essential stylistic principal of Shakespeare's prose. In the remaining six chapters Mr. Barish analyzes the logical tactics that Jonson used to transmute character through speech. Particularly in the second chapter, "Prose as Prose," he focuses on Jonson's use of the "curt" and "loose" techniques of the anti-rhetorical tradition in style. The last chapter, "Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy," enables him to point up the triumph of prose as the language of comedy in the growth of realistic expression.

Fredson Thayer Bowers, Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy 1587-1682, Gloucester, Mass., Peter Smith, 1959, pp 284.

The vitality of this now almost classic work is shown by its republication almost twenty years after its original appearance. Professor Bowers surveys revenge from Seneca through the Anglo-Saxon period to the time of the Elizabethans and finds, strangely enough, that "the Elizabethans gave it no critical recognition." They saw the violence of Seneca, but not the revenge as such. J. Greene in his Refutation of the Apology for Actors in 1615 catalogues everything but revenge. "The matter of Tragedies is haughtiness, arrogancy, ambition, pride, iniury, anger, wrath, enuy, hatred, contentaion, warre, murther, cruelty, rapine, incist, roulngs, depredations, piracys, spoyles, roberies, rebellions, treasons, killing, hewing, stabbing, dagger-drawing, fighting, butchery, trechery, villany &c. and all kinds of heroyck euils whatsoeuer." The English took their themes from legendary history, Italian and Germanic stories. A characteristic not found in Seneca was the "strong opposing force moving against the avenger. All Senecan revengers were villains, whereas the early Elizabethan stage revengers began as heroes." And though they were almost hopeless at the beginning, the English gained in strength though opposed by a Machiavellian force—like Claudius in Hamlet. But this is no place to summarize the book. Peter Smith of Gloucester or your local bookseller will be happy to supply you with this important volume.

Bertram Joseph, The Tragic Actor, New York, Theatre Arts Books, 1959. pp. 415, $9.50.

From numerous eye witness descriptions and similar reports, Bertram Joseph has produced a book of great interest to all lovers of drama. The tragic actor makes great demands on the actor and in this book we see the results from the period of Shakespeare to the end of the 19th century. It is to be expected that the great Shakespearean actors would achieve great prominence in such a volume and they do—Betterton, Quinn, Garrick, and Kembles, Kean, Macready, Pheips, Irving, and Forbes-Robertson are each given an "Age." The plays of Shakespeare are also the focal point of much description. The quotations try to recreate the voice, diction, delivery, stage business, style, pantomimic power, identification with character, transition of emotions, etc., Discussions over changes in style are interesting and informative. Clement Scott, for example, objected to the "mouthing, over-gesticulating, roaring, ranting, and barn-storming of some of the immediate followers of the old Macready school," but the 'tea-cup and saucer school' was no improvement. (p. 386) What is good acting may be found in a paraphrase of what is sad about Forbes-Robertson: The best tragic acting is that which recreates a style suited and admired by the new age but still not sacrificing any essential of the past which is worth preserving.

Elizabethan Prose Translation, Edited with an Introduction by James Winny, Cambridge University Press, 1960, xxii, 151, $3.00.

This small but interesting volume contains selections from a dozen authors who were translated into English between 1561—Hoby's translation of Castiglione's The Courtier to Florio's translation of Montaigne's Essays in 1603. Awakened to a new curiosity and aware of her cultural inferiority, England tourned from herself to the history, culture, philosophy, conduct books, essays, and fiction of her contemporary neighbors and the classics. By so doing the English broadened their outlook, read and were disenchanted from the scholastic writers, and by 1605 were ready for Bacon's Advancement of Learning, and the new scientific outlook. In the Schoolmen Bacon found "cobwebs of learning, admirable for the fineness of thread and work, but of no substance of profit." An offshoot of the interest in translation came in the form of an improved English prose, so lively and robust, so independent of its original, that Shakespeare, for example, was able to use North almost directly from his text. Each of the selections is preceded by a short but scholarly prefatory note.

Shakespeare's Songs and Poems, Edited by Edward Hubler, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1959, pp. vii-xxiv, 534, $5.50.

Professor Hubler's Sense of Shakespeare's Sonnets of 1954 is here supplemented by a volume of all the sonnets and poems of Shakespeare including the poems and songs found in the plays and the snatches of songs sung by the characters. The Sonnets and po ems from the plays are printed on the right hand of the page with the notes and useful commentary on the left. The longer poems are printed with commentary in the margins. The commentary frequently helps interpret the poem and sets it in its context in the series or in the play in which it appears. Professor Hubler sees "little need to question his authorship" of the epitaph on Shakespeare's gravestone and includes it along witht the other poems. The type is large and the commentary directed toward the general reader as well as the student.

William Rosen, Shakespeare and the Craft of Tragedy, Harvard U. P., 1960. 231 pp. $4.75.

Shakespeare and the Craft of Tragedy is a study of the dramatic structures of King Lear, Macbeth, Antony and Cleopatra, and Coriolanus, with the emphasis on how the "point of view of an audience is established towards the protagonist." By having other characters talk about his heroes, Shakespeare "prefigures" their entrance and imposes upon the audience a specific point of view. From the value judgments of others the spectators acquire a dramatic attitude toward the central figure. In King Lear the leitmotif of the opening scene is that Lear has no "true insight into himself." Kent focuses attention on the problem of appearance versus reality. And Lear's subsequent actions show that he is blindly detached from reality as a result of his belief in his own infallibility.

While Lear learns to show concern for others and proceeds toward humility and enlightenment, Macbeth follows the reverse order. He begins as the valiant supporter of his king but becomes hardened to evil. By creating an atmosphere of bewilderment rather than establishingMacbeth's character in the opening scene to Macbeth, Shakespeare develops an overwhelming sense of suspense as the imagination is directed "towards a gloomy world where values and judgments are precariously unstable."

To each of the plays a chapter is devoted. King Lear and Macbeth were chosen because the rapport is established between the audience and the protagonist; Antony and Cleopatra and Coriolanus were selected because that rapport is "to a great extent" missing. The contrast in Shakespeare's handling of these points of view helps explain why the plays communicate different types of experiences. In King Lear and Macbeth the audience sees events primarily from within the protagonists' own consciousness; in the other two tragedies it sees events through the eyes of "raisonneurs" who understand the protagonists and analyze their behavior.

OXFORD

books of exceptional interest

SHAKESPEARE'S COMEDIES

By Bertrand Evans

The comedies and romances are examined individually, in chronological order and in considerable detail, throwing light on participants and actions, on the worlds containing them, and on Shakespeare as a dramatic artist. All the plays are approached from the point of view of dramatic characterization. $6.75

The Autobiography of Thomas Whythorne

edited by

James Osborn

The life story of a gifted musician, written about 1576, including acute observations on town and country life in sixteenth-century England. Although Thomas Whythorne published the earliest extant book of English madrigals in 1571, little more than his name was known, even to musicologists, until the recent discovery of his manuscript autobiography A Book of Songs and Sonnets. Coming in January $6.75

At all bookstores

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

SHAKESPEARE AND MEDICINE: A BIBLIOGRAPHY

By Robert C. Steensma
State University of South Dakota

Although medicine is one of the most intriguing aspects of Elizabethan civilization, the only modern scholarly study dealing with its relationship to Shakespeare and his work is R. R. Simpson's Shakespeare and Medicine (Edinburgh, 1959). The following bibliography is a selective listing of books and articles which are concerned with Elizabethan medicine and Shakespeare's use of it in his plays. Insofar as possible items dealing with psychology are not included.

I. Medicine in the Age of Shakespeare

Ackerknecht, Erwin H. A Short History of Medicine. (New York, 1955), pp. 73-117.

Anon. Medical Knowledge in Tudor England. San Marino, 1932.

Barrett, C. R. B. The History of the Society of Apothecaries of London. London, 1905.

Black, J. B. The Reign of Elizabeth. (Oxford. 1936), pp. 265-268.

Bowers, F. T. "The Audience and the Poisoners of Elizabethan Tragedy," JEGP, XXXVI (1937). 491-504.

Camden, Carroll Jr. "Elizabethan Astrological Medicine," Annals of Medical History, N. S. II (1930), 217-226.

Creighton, Charles. A History of Epidemics in Britain from A. D. 664 to the Extinction of the Plague. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1891.

————————. "Public Health," Social England, ed. H. D. Traill and J. S. Mann (London, 1902), II, 161, 319-323, 568-572, 753-759; III, 190-201, 366-371, 763-770; IV, 205-214.

Davies, Godfrey. The Early Stuarts, 1603-1660 (Oxford, 1937), pp. 361-364.

———————— (comp.) "Medicine," Bibliography of British History: Stuart Period, 1603-1714 (Oxford, 1928), pp. 263-267.

Davis, William S. "Concerning Plagues, Physicians, and Funerals," Life in Elizabethan Days (New York, 1930), pp. 162-173.

Doran, Alban H. G. "Medicine," Shakespeare's England, ed. C. T. Onions (Oxford, 1916), I, 413-443.

Edgar, I. I. "Elizabethan Conceptions of the Physiology of the Circulation," Annals of Medical History, VIII (1936). 359-370. 456-465.

Power, Sir D'Arcy. The Place of the Tudor Surgeons in English Literature. London, 1927.

Read, Conyers (comp.). "Medicine and Disease." Bibliography of British History: Tudor Period, 1485-1603 (Oxford, 1933), pp. 255-256.

Silvette, H. "The Doctor on the Stage: Medicine and Medical Men in 17th Century English Drama," Annals of Medical History, VIII (1936), 520 ff.; IX (1937), 62-88, 174-189, 264-279, 482-507.

Smith, Goldwin. "The Practice of Medicine in Tudor England," Scientific Monthly, L (1940), 65-72.

South, J. F. (comp.) Memorials of the Craft of Surgery in England. Edited by D'Arcy Power. London, 1886.

Spencer, H. R. Medicine in the Days of Shakespeare. London, 1929.

Wilson, F. P. The Plague in Shakespeare's England. Oxford, 1927.

Wolf, A. "Medicine," A History of Science, Technology, and Philosophy in the 16th and 17th Centuries (2nd ed.; London, 1950), pp. 425-449.

Wright, Louis B. "The Strange World of Science," Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England (Chapel Hill, 1935), pp. 549-602.

Yearsley, M. Doctors in Elizabethan Drama. London, 1934.

Young, Sidney. The Annals of the Barber Surgeons of London. London, 1890.

Zilboorg, G. The Medical Man and the Witch during the Renaissance. Baltimore, 1935.

II. Medicine in Shakespeare's Plays

Andes, Andre. Shakespeare et la folie; etude medico-psychologique. Paris, 1936.

Anderson, R. L. "As Heart Can Think," SAB, XII (1937), 246-251.

Anon. Shakespeare e la scienza moderna-Messina, 1897.

Anon. "Shakespeare's Insane Root," British Medical Journal, I (1907), 28, 788.

Aubert, H. Shakespeare als Mediziner. Rostock, 1873.

Bristow, W. J. "Shakespeare as Physiologist," Southern Medicine and Sugery, XCIV (1932), 274-276.

Brussel, James A. " 'Doctor' William Shakespeare," General Magazine and Historical Chronicles, LI (1949), 163-166.

Bucknill, J. C. The Medical Knowledge of Shakespeare. London, 1860.

Camden, Carroll Jr. "An Absurdity in King Lear?" PQ, XI (1932), 408-409.

————————. "Shakespeare on Sleep and Dreams," Rice Institute Pamphlets, XXIII (1936), 106-133.

————————. "The Suffocation of the Mother," MLN, LXIII (1948). 390-393.

Cartaz, A. La Toxicologie dans les Drames de Shakespeare. Paris, 1911.

Chandler, Simon B. "Shakespeare and Sleep," Bulletin of the History of Medicine, XXIX (1955). 255-260.

Chesney, J. P. Shakespeare as a Physician. Chicago 1884.

Clarke, W. B. "Shakespeare in Medicine," American Homeopathy, XXIV (1898), 377-385.

Clemen, Wolfgang. "Das Krankheitssymbol bei Shakespeare," Shakespeare Bilder (Bonn, 1936), pp 261-270.

Cruttwell, Patrick. "Physiology and psychology in Shakespeare's Age," JHI, XII (1951), 75-89.

De Lorde, A. "La Medecine au Theatre: Shakespeare et Brieux," Les Nouvelles Litteraires, Nov. 13, 1937, p. 10.

Dodek, S. M. "Shakespeare's Knowledge of Medicine," Medical Annals of the District of Columbia, I (1933), 317-321.

Donnellan, P. S. "Medical Allusions in Shakespeare's Plays," American Medicine, III (1902), 278 ff.

Doran, A. "Shakespeare and the Medical Society," British Medical Journal, I (1899), 1201-1205.

Dunlap, A. R. "What Purgative Drug?" MLN, LIV (1939), 92-94.

Edgar, I. I. "Medical Practice and the Physician in Elizabethan England and in Shakespeare's Dramas," Medical Life, July, 1934, p. 22.

————————. "Shakespeare's Acquisition of Medical and Psychopathological Knowledge," Canadian Medical Association Journal, XXXIII (1935), 319-326.

————————. "Shakespeare's Medical Knowledge," Annals of Medical History N. S. VI (1934), 150-168.

————————. "Shakespeare's Medical Knowledge: A Study in Criticism," Annals of Medical History, N. S. VII (1935), 519-531.

Eliason, Norman E. "Shakespeare's Purgative Drug Cyme," MLN, LVII (1942), 663-665.

Epstein, H. B. William Shakespeare, M. D. Newark, 1932.

Ficarra, Bernard J. "Surgical References in Shakespeare," Essays on Historical Medicine (New York, 1948), pp. 89-93.

Field, B. R. "Medico-Shakespearean Fanaticism," Shakespeariana, VI (1889), 1-20.

Getchell, A. C. "The Medical Knowledge of Shakespeare," Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, CLVI (1907), 65ff., 109 ff.

Gillespie, J. D. Medical Notes about Shakespeare and His Times. Edinburgh, 1875.

Goldblat, H. "Shakespeare als Psysiognomiker." Psychologie und Medizin, IV (1930), 83-110.

Goldbloom, A. "Shakespeare and Pediatrics," American Journal of Diseases of Children, LI (1936). 653-665.

Green-Armytage, V. B. "Gynaecology and Obstetrics in Shakespeare," Indian Medical Gazette, LXV (1930), 333-339.

Griffiths, L. M. "Shakespeare and the Practice of Medicine," Annals of Medical History, III (1921), 50 ff.

Gwynn, E. "Shakespeare and Sanitation." Public Health, XI (1898), 695-702.

Hagemann, J. A. "Shakespeare's Conception of Medical Topics," Medical Record, LXXXIX (1916), 780 ff.

Hall, J. "Shakespeare's Family as Patients," Bristol Medico-Chirurgical Journal, IX (1891), 238-240.

Hawley, R. N. "The Medical Lore of Shakespeare," Medical Age, X (1892), 740-753.

Heilman, Robert B. "Dr. Iago and His Potions," VQR, XXVIII (1952), 568-584.

Herxheimer, K. "Shakespeare und die Hautkrankheiten," Dermatologische Wochenschrift, XLI (1931), 1599.

Hirschberg, Julius. "Shakespeare—Anmerkungen eines Augenarztes," SJ. LVI (1920), 95-105.

Huhner, M. "Male and Female Created He Them," Medical Times, March, (1940), p. 4.

Jha, A. "Shakespeare and Sleep." Shakespearean Comedy (Allahabad, 1930), pp. 152-161.

Johnson, E. D. "Shakespeare's Medical Knowledge," Baconiana. XXVIII (1944). 98-102.

Keil, Harry. "Scabies and the Queen Mab Passage in Romeo and Juliet." JHI. XVIII (1957), 394-410.

Kocher, Paul H. "Lady Macbeth and the Doctor." SQ. V (1954), 341-349.

Line, W. H. "Shakespeare's Doctors," Midland Medical Journal, V (1906), 86-88.

Lockhart, F. A. L. "Medicine in Shakespeare," Vermont Medical Monthly, XII (1906), 257-263.

Macht, David I. "Calendula or Marigold in Medical History and in Shakespeare," Bulletin of the History of Medicine, XXIX (1955), 491-502.

————. "A Physiological and Pharmacological Appreciation of Hamlet, I, v, 59-73." Bulletin of the History of Medicine, XXIII (1949), 186-194.

————. "Shakespeare's Allusions to Clotting and Blood Clotting Drugs," Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, XII (March, 1951), no pagination.

Macht, D. J. "Pharmacological Appreciation of Hamlet: On the Instillation of Poisons into the Ear," Bulletin of Johns Hopkins Hospital, XXVIII (1918), 165 ff.

Melvin, G. G. "The Medicine of Shakespeare," Maritime Medical News, XXII (1909), 51-60.

Meyer, A. W. "The Physician and the Surgeon in Shakespeare," John Hopkins Hospital Bulletin, XVIII (1907), 430-438.

————. "Some Characteristics of the Medicine in Shakespeare," John Hopkins Hospital Bulletin, XVIII (1907), 1-11.

Minges, G. "Medicine in Shakespeare," St. Louis Clinique, XVII (1904), 263-270.

Moyes, J. Medicine and Kindred Arts in Shakespeare. Glasgow, 1896.
Contains a good bibliography.

Owen, O. W. "The Medicine in Shakespeare," Physician and Surgeon, XV (1893), 289-297.

Pomeranz, Herman. Medicine in the Shakespearean Plays, and Dickens' Doctors. New York, 1936.

Sigismund, Reinhold. "Die medizinische Kenntnis Shakespeares," SJ, XVI (1881), 39-143; XVII (1882), 6-66; XVIII (1883), 36-80.

Simpson, R. R. Shakespeare and Medicine. Edinburgh, 1959.

Smith, Roland M. "Macbeth's Cyme Once More," MLN, LX (1945), 33-38.

Sullivan, Frank. "Cyme, a Purgative Drug," MLN, LVI (1941), 263-264.

————. "Hamlet's Hebone and Mercury Poisoning," Los Angeles Tidings, Dec. 31, 1948, p. 9.

Steadman, John M. "Falstaff's 'Facies Hippocratica': A Note on Shakespeare and Renaissance Medical Theory," SN, XXIX (1957), 130-135.

Tannenbaum, S. A. "An Absurdity in King Lear," SRL, VIII (1932), 46.

————. "A Medical Allusion," SRL, VIII (1932), 607.

————. "Dr. Tannenbaum Replies," PQ, XII (1933), 88-90.

————. "Shakespeare's 'Heartstrings', SAB, VIII (1933), 133-136.

Thiersch, C. "Medizinische Glossen zum Hamlet," Nord und Sud, VI (1878), 231-254.

Thompson, St. C. "Shakespeare as a Guide in the Art and Practice of Medicine," Canadian Medical Association Journal, IX (1909), 901 ff.

Thomson, W. Bacon and Shakespeare on Vivesection. Melbourne, 1881.

Vest, W. E. "William Shakespeare, Syphilographer," West Virginia Medical Quarterly, XXXIV (1938), 130-137.

————. "William Shakespeare," Therapeutist," Southern Medical Journal, XXXVII (1944), 457-464.

Wachholz, L. "Medicolegal Problems in Shakespeare," Beitrage zur gerichtlichen Medizin, VIII (1928), 33-38.

Wainwright, J. W. The Medical and Surgical Knowledge of William Shakespeare. New York, 1915.

Walsh, Groesbeck and Pool, R. M. "Laterality Dominance in Shakespeare's Plays," Southern Medicine and Surgery, CIV (1942), 51-58.

————. Shakespeare's Knowledge of Twins and Twinning. Fairfield ,Alabama, 1940.

Watson, E. M. "Medical Lore in Shakespeare," Annals of Medical History, N. S. VIII (1936), 249-265.

Wile, Ira S. "Dentistry and Dentists as Portrayed by Shakespeare," Colophon, XIX (1934), no pagination.

Wilson, J. Dover. "A Note on Richard III: The Bishop of Ely's Strawberries," MLR, LII (1957), 563-564.

Witt, W. H. "Medical References in Shakespeare," Journal of the Tennessee Medical Association, III (1938), 1-10.

Wolff, L. "Medical Concepts in Shakespeare's Works," Hygeia XCIX (1937), 177-304.

Woolenberg, R. Shakespeare, Personliches aus Welt und Werk: Abhandlungen zur Geaschichte der Medizin und der Naturwissenchaften. Berlin, 1939.

Biography in Brief:

Frederick James Furnivall, Sham Shakespearean?

JOHN J. McALEER, BOSTON COLLEGE

Frederick James Furnivall (1825-1910), studied mathematics at Cambridge, and law at Lincoln's Inn. Given such a background it is not surprising that his studies in English literature began as a scientific attempt to discover the "social conditions of the English people in the past." This approach to literature, which he never forsook, is at once the glory and the bane of his scholarship. It yoked his prodigious energies and drove him to launch heroic projects, the NED, the EETS, and the Chaucer, Ballad, Shakspere, Wyclif, Browning, and Shelley Societies. But it left him virtually indifferent to the aesthetic worth of the works he examined.

The fact that Furnivall "was not a fully equipped Shakespearean scholar" when he founded the New Shakespeare Society in 1873, did not trouble him. His work on the succession of Chaucer's poems, which he saw as a necessary preliminary to following the growth of the poet's mind and art, had put Chaucer studies on a sound footing. He meant to do the same for Shakespeare, and in the same way. It was this clinical procedure which exasperated critics like John Jeremiah, author of Furnivallos Furioso (1876).

To a translation of Gervinus's Commentaries on Shakespeare (1874), Furnivall prefixed an essay on determining the order of Shakespeare's plays by metrical tests. F. G. Fleay followed with more metrical tests which Swinburne, fuming about "Sham Shakespeareans," scoffed at in the Examiner (1876). Furnivall knew Fleay's views were extreme but, to defend his own principles, rebuked Swinburne with a devastating attack on the latter's speculations on triple ending lines in Henry VIII. Swinburne seemed ready then to drop the matter, but Furnivall kept it up, ridiculing the poet's remarks on Edward III and denouncing him to his friends with abusive postcards. In A Study of Shakespeare (1880), which he dedicated to Halliwell-Phillipps, Swinburne retaliated with a lively parody of the Shakespere Society. "Because he let the dedication stand, Halliwell-Phillips—now called "Hell-P" —felt Furnivall's wrath in notes to a facsimile of the 1604 Hamlet Quarto. Browning president of the Society, was appealed to but declined to intervene and H-P spitefully published Furnivall's letters (1881). As a result many of the Society's 67 vice-presidents resigned, an event from which it never fully recovered.

The dispute led to excess on both sides, each translating the other's name with malicious delight. Furnivall's Pigsbrook and Co. (1881) was incredibly coarse. Swinburne, who called Furnivall "Brotheldyke," and his Society, "a blackguard's gang of blockheads," was hardly more temperate. "Was that the dog?" he gasped years later, when Furnivall was pointed out to him.

Despite this appalling feud, Furnivall's Shakespearean labors were profitable. The Society, the Leopold preface, the editions of Harrison's Description of England and Stubbe's Anatomie of Abuses, and the photographic facsimiles of the Quartos (43 vols.), and even the disputed metrical tests, all attest the indebtedness of modern Shakespearean studies to the irascible Doctor.

Although Furnivall's bluntness often put him in trouble (it is said he thought tact to be dishonest), his friends were legion and his kindness legendary. He once sold his books to aid striking woodchoppers. It was commonplace for him to manage a friend"s affairs in hard times or to set his books in the street while he ran to the assistance of a fallen horse. His vast undertakings (e.g., the six-text edition of Chaucer, the 39 volumes edited for the EETS, 30,000 entries in the NED) brought him less than 500 pounds all told. A bank failure left him, in later years, all but dependent on a 150 pound Civil List's pension. Yet he never halted his painstaking labors until the last days of his life when cancer ravaged him. His books and MSS. are at King's College, London.

Professor McAleer, our new "Biography in Brief" editor obtained his Ph.D. at Harvard and taught there before he joined the Boston College faculty. He is currently engaged on a study of pre-Shakespearean drama.

Yale Shakespeare Institute

The Yale Shakespeare Institute, running this year from July 25 to August 12, completed its fifth successful year by offering students of all ages and academic backgrounds three weeks of intensive study of six dramas, three being those produced at nearby Stratford. The Institute is sponsored jointly by the Office of Teacher Training (in the Master of Arts in Teaching program) and by the American Shakespeare Festival Theatre and is directed by Professor Charles T. Prouty, the distinguished Shakespearean scholar of Yale University.

Fourteen of the lectures were given by Mr. Prouty himself, who discussed critically the plays produced at Stratford—**The Tempest, Twelfth Night, and Antony and Cleopatra**—as well as **Henry the Fourth, Parts 1 and 2, and Hamlet.** After the members of the Institute had seen each of the productions at Stratford, it was analyzed vigorously and constructively. Seven other lectures were given by Professor Alvin Kernan of the Yale staff and dealt with the Elizabethan background, the Shakespearean theatre, the acting companies, and the Shakespearean texts. Mr. Frank McMullan of the Yale Drama Department and the first American to be invited to direct a play at Stratford-upon-Avon also lectured and showed slides, treating especially the stage he had used in producing **Hamlet** in 1949. Ten hours of discussion were spent in seminars under the leadership of Mr. Kernan and of two other members of the Yale staff, Mr. Brady and Mr. Crump.

Trips to Stratford produced seven hours of lectures by Director Jack Landau, Ricard Evans, Frances Barnard, Morris Carnovsky, and by Richard Harrier of New York University. These speakers concerned themselves with acting and dramaturgy in general (with a trip backstage), Elizabethan music, and Shakespeare's approach to history and to the life of his own day.

Although this program carries four semester hours of credit at the graduate level, it is by no means directed to teachers only and has been attended by those of various businesses and professions, some from as far away as California. For those who seek academic credit there are a term paper and a final examination. However, the Institute is also open to auditors, who may attend lectures and seminars as they please and are excused from the paper and the examination. Scholarships are available as well as accommodations in Yale dormitories.

James E. Warren, Jr. The Lovett School

"TO BE OR NOT TO BE"
ESSENTIALLY DRAMATIC

The soliloquy "To be or not to be" is a quintessential expression of what the play is about—both suicide and revenge. This is the thesis of Professor C. C. Clarke of the University of New England, who considers the soliloquy as essentially dramatic, with Hamlet's perplexity and attitude acted out in "the tensions of meaning" and through "the living movement of the verse." A change of mood is expressed in the repetition of **end**—ending troubles being associated with both revenge and suicide (suffering in the mind being identified with idea of self.) The sense of **quietus** (acquittance given in payment of sums due) accents the theme of both suicide and revenge. The tragic situation comes from Hamlet's being doomed to action against which his nature revolts. ("A Note on 'To be or not to be,'" **Essays in Criticism**, X:1 (Jan. 1960), 18-23.

Shakespeare in Egypt

Dr. R. K. Yajnik, M. A., Ph. D. (London)

During my recent sojourn in the West, it was indeed a pleasure and a privilege to meet A. Hamrouche, General Director of the Egyptian National Theatre at Cairo and Mr. Fattouh, the gifted producer of the National Theatre. The latter is a successful actor and a versatile director. He studied the art of the theatre in Paris in the Conservatoire De Paris from 1935 to 1939.

The National Theatre—which spends 7000 pounds a year—is a Government subsidized institution, dedicated to the cultivation of all the theatrical arts such as Music, Dancing and Drama. It is a beautifully built thearte with most of the modern theatrical equipment. It is capable of seating about 800 spectators.

The system is a repertory system wherein Shakespearean plays, Greek masterpieces and Russian plays are produced by rotation, and also new ventures are tried—all in the Arabic, the National Language. Of course, this Arabic is polished, of a little superior type which is not understood by the man in the street. They have produced tragedies of Sophocles and Shakespeare's **Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Julius Caesar, The Merchant of Venice and Romeo and Juliet.**

In 1935 **The Merchant of Venice** was acted for about 30 nights. In 1936 **King Lear** was performed for about 25 nights and in 1937, 50 performances were given of **Othello.**

The important thing about these productions is the wonderful fidelity to the original master-pieces of Shakespeare. These were translations with Shakespearean names. The costumes were of Greece or Italy or France or England of those days in the typical Elizabethan style; only the language was Arabic. On the whole, they were produced with enthusiasm and insight, without much elaborate scenery; yet it is indeed noteworthy that Egypt could provide a cosmopolitan and cultural audience for about 25 performances of each Shakespearean play acted there.

The actor George Abiad spent seven years in Paris studying the Theatre from 1905 to 1912. He played Hamlet in 1917 with Jewish girls and later on with Syrian girls in female roles. Then he acted Othello. When the National Theatre opened in 1935 he acted in the Arabic translation of **King Lear** and as Shylock in the **Merchant of Venice.** Another great actor Zaki Telemat was also deputed to France to study the Theatre. He acted Shylock with conspicuous success.

In earlier theatres—an Opera House was built in 1869 and remodeled in 1936, Sheikh Salama Hegazy distinguished himself in 1902 as Romeo. He also proved popular as Hamlet when the play was produced during the run of Shakespearean plays from 1902 to 1906. These plays were produced with songs, scenery and costumes.

On the whole, I was impressed by the profound reverence and love of the Egyptians for Shakespeare. It is the ambition of the great Egyptian actors and actresses to excel in the art of playing the chief roles of the Shakespearean comedies and tragedies. The playgoers in the National Theatre are critical in their judgments and compare the acting of their nationals with that of British, American and other great actors in their respective roles. The ambition of the producer and the director is to recreate the Shakespearean spirit by reproducing the Greek or the Roman or the British or the French atmosphere of Shakespearean plays. The writer does not take any liberties with the script of the play and treats every word of Shakespeare with respect trying to preserve the quintessence of the Shakespearean genius. —Rajkot, India

The Itinerant Scholar

At the S.-Central Renaissance Conf. Apr. 1960

Hamlet and the Detective Story

Wm. R. Wray, East Central State College

Hamlet contains a universal detective-story situation—a crime to be exposed and a criminal to be brought to account—and thus has numerous motifs and situations of detective stories. Although these similarities do not add up to a detective drama, yet the detective-story genre may provide, as it were, a complex metaphor that casts light upon the structure of **Hamlet.** **Hamlet** resembles both the medieval or supernatural detective story (e.g., Chaucer's **Prioress's Tale; Nun's Priest's Tale,** VII, 2984-3062) and the modern or cogitative detective story (Poe's ratiocinative tales, the Sherlock Holmes stories). It resembles the former in the action (Act I) centering about the appearance and revelation of the Ghost, and the latter in the action (Acts II, III) centering about the hero's antic disguise and his mousetrap scheme.

But **Hamlet** lacks anything resembling the climax typical of either kind of detective story. For in its climax the medieval detective story tends to be an affirmation of a religion view of life; the modern detectve story, an affirmation of a scientific view of life. Whereas the detective story climaxes in a burst of dogmatic clarity, **Hamlet** eventuates in a cloud of tragic ambiguity.

Modern criticism must guard against its conscious or unconscious scientific bias and avoid giving the climax of the play scene a Conan Doylesque coloration (as Prof. Dover Wilson does). Numerous signals in the play suggest that the mousetrap is a tragic failure rather than a detective-story success.

Elizabethan Reprints

Cornwallis, Sir William. DISCOURSES UPON SENECA THE TRAGEDIAN (1601). $5.00

Florio, John. SECOND FRUTES (1591). $6.00

Huarte, Juan. THE EXAMINATION OF MENS WITS (1594). Englished by Richard Carew. $7.50.

Johnson, Robert. ESSAIES OR RATHER IMPERFECT OFFERS (1607). $5.00

Palingenius, Marcellus. THE ZODIAKE OF LIFE (1576). Translated by Barnabe Googe. $6.00

Persons, Robert. THE JUDGMENT OF A CATHOLICKE ENGLISH-MAN LIVING IN BANISHMENT FOR HIS RELIGION (1608). $6.00.

Solinus, Caius Julius. THE EXCELLENT AND PLEASANT WORKE COLLECTANEA RERUM Memorabilium (1587). Translated by Arthur Golding. $7.50

Turler, Jerome. THE TRAVEILER (1575). $6.50

SCHOLARS' FACSIMILES & REPRINTS

Harry R. Warfel, General Editor

118 N. W. 26th St.

Gainesville, Florida, U.S.A.

DISSERTATION DIGEST

Edited by

Jack R. Brown, Marshall College

Baretti and the Shakespearean Influence in Italy: A Study in Eighteenth Century Polemics in Italy. Gerald Alfred Tucci, New York University, 1960. 397 pages.

Dr. Tucci's dissertation is an investigation into the source of Baretti's ideas and theories, particularly in regard to Shakespeare, and into his influence in interpreting Shakespeare and English culture to Italy. From the middle of the seventeenth century, English admiration for things Italian had given place to admiration for things French; Baretti, principally through his Shakespearean criticism, stands out as a major figure in the re-establishment of mutual Anglo-Italian respect.

Baretti's thirty years in England, where he became one of Johnson's literary coterie, were of great significance in the formulation of his critical ideas and theories. Johnson, "mio venerato maestro," was of particular importance in bringing Baretti to an appreciation of Shakespeare. When Voltaire "deprecated Shakespeare in the eyes of Europe" in his **Lettre a l'Academie Francaise** (1776), Baretti immediately published a rebuttal in his **Discours sur Shakespeare et sur M. Voltaire** (1777).

Baretti's efforts entitle him to recognition as an early interpreter of Shakespeare to his Italian countrymen, as a critic "unknowingly responsible" to some degree for a romantic trend in Italy, and as a writer who did much "to foster a renewed Anglo-Italian literary and cultural rapprochement.

The Shakespearean Othello: A Critical Examination on Historical Evidence. Lawrence J. Ross, Princeton University, 1957. 1345 pages.

Dr. Ross contends that previous criticism of **Othello** "has failed to make consistent or complete sense of the play, to remove the perennial interpretative dilemmas about it, or to show that it possesses coherence of structure, magnitude of concern, credibility of character and action, and representative tragic significance." His dissertation is a critical re-examination of **Othello** in the light of certain traditions, an understanding of which is essential to a satisfactory interpretation of the play. The first, and the source of Shakespeare's "basic indebtedness" in **Othello**, is the Christian tradition. "He is specifically indebted for commonplace structures of values, doctrines and figurative concepts, symbols, and imagery." Tradition in the visual arts is established as the second "basically important aid" to understanding of the play.

Under Dr. Ross's analysis, **Othello** is seen as "a symbolic tragedy of moral choice whose dramatic action is the progressive realization of the hero's foreshadowed 'fall to reprobance.' "

A Comparative Analysis of Two Major Types of Shakespearean Villains, in the Characters Iago and Richard III.

M. S. Thesis, Purdue University, June 1958. By John J. von Szeliski.

Thesis: Shakespeare's dramatic insight into effective stage villainy is most profound in the character of Iago and illustrates reasons for Shakespeare's being at his dramaturgical best in **Othello** and traces much of the process of his maturation in the business of characterization. Also, the nature of motivation or motive-type in the characterization of villains had an important bearing on successful characterization.

First, each of the histories and tragedies was examined for the presence of a major villain—the latter being defined as a character who, for a selfish end, deliberately violates common notions of morality sanctioned by the audience or ordinary reader, doing so as a prominent force in the play so that he or she vitally affects the outcome of the major plot of the drama. Eight such characters were found: Aaron, in **Titus Andronicus**; Iago, in **Othello**; Macbeth, in **Macbeth**; Edmund, Goneril, and Regan in **King Lear**; Claudius, in **Hamlet**; and Richard, in **Richard III.**

Iago and Richard were then compared, as chief representatives, respectively, of the revenge and the ambition motive-types according to several elements, including: the goal of the character; the original source of the character's motive; what other characters say of the character studied; personality images of the character; and explanations for the character's conduct.

Through extensive study of the texts of the plays involved complemented by authoritative critical opinion and interpretation, these chief conclusions were drawn: Iago's motive-type, featuring personal, egoistic aberration, is unique—giving him a unique quality-type as well. His psychologically reasonable distortion of minor stimuli into major revenge, compared to the more dramaturgically transparent and arbitrary villainous motivation of the other villains, makes him Shakespeare's most effective villain. This effectiveness in villainous portrayal, as seen in production popularity of his plays among many other things, denotes a significant dramaturgical milestone in Shakespeare's playwriting career.

William A. Boyce, Melancholy in Shakespeare's Comedies, M. A. Thesis, University of Denver, July, 1958.

It can be conjectured only that Shakespeare was acquainted with any published treatises on melancholy, but research has disclosed that knowledge of melancholy and its causes and effects was common around the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries. This would account for Shakespeare's understanding of the humour in all its phases.

The purpose of the study was to make a comparative analysis of the melancholic characters in Shakespeare's comedies and the published conceptions of melancholy of the period to determine their types; to discover their symptoms, the causes, and proposed cures; and to show the effect, if any, of the characters upon the action of the plays.

The study revealed a close parallel between the "scientific" conceptions of melancholy, as discussed by Timothy Bright in **A Treatise of Melancholie** and by Robert Burton in **The Anatomy of Melancholy**, and Shakespeare's 'literary" conception of the humour. Shakespeare's characters' melancholy is caused by love, sorrow, desire for revenge, discontentment or self-love. The types of melancholics fall into two categories: **love melancholics**, or sufferers of unsatisfied love or jealousy, and **malcontents**, or melancholy travelers, melancholy cynics, melancholy villains, and melancholy scholars.

There is no distinct difference in the treatment of the melancholic in Shakespeare's periods of development. On the other hand, the comedies of his second period reveal a greater number of melancholics, which, it is conjectured, was the result of a general disillusionment of the times and the melancholic, who was quite prevalent and reflected this feeling, was no longer an object of easy laughter. The melancholics in the plays of this period serve mainly as foils for the geniality in other characters. In later comedies the evilness of the passion of love is the basis for several characters.

It is the combination of Aristotelian and Galenic conceptions of melancholy that gives Shakespeare's melancholics their demensional characteristics, as contrasted with the melancholics of other playwrights of the period. Shakespeare's use of melancholy develops from a compassionate ridicule of a vogue to a genuine concern of the humour as a means for fuller character development.

FRAMEWORK OF THE MERCHANT OF VENICE

Graham Midgeley of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, finds the parallel between Shylock and Antonio to be the framework of **The Merchant of Venice**: "I would suggest that the two focal points of the play are Shylock and, not the lovers or the romance theme, but Antonio, and that the world of love and marriage is not opposed by Shylock,but rather paralleled by Venetian society as a whole, social, political and economic . . . . As Shylock is to Venetian society, so is Antonio to the world of love and marriage." Both men are outsiders; the play, in effect, "a twin study in loneliness." This thesis contributes to the understanding of the play by reinstating Antonio to a position in the play commesurate with which Shakespeare developed the character, by making it unnecessary to condemn Shylock, and by making more impressive the construction of the play, especially Acts IV and V. Antonio's melancholy is analyzed as due to his all-absorbing love for Bassanio. Visualization of Act IV (on one side of the stage glittering youth of Venice, Duke, magnificoes; on the other, Shylock, beaten and alone) and of Act V (on the one hand moonlight, lovers, reunion, formal and polite welcome of Antonio, then the lovers' leaving two by two—and Antonio on the other hand left alone to follow the triumphant pair of lovers, bearing out his self-description as the tainted wether of the flock) shows the significance of Mr. Midgeley's thesis. ("The Merchant of Venice: A Reconsideration", **Essays in Criticism**, X:2 (April 1960), 119-133.)

SHAKESPEARE'S PROPHETIC LABEL IN CYMBELINE

H. L. Rogers of the University of Sydney notes that "the prophetic label in **Cymbeline**" may be traced plainly to Holinshed as a source (the 1577 edition, not W. G. Boswell-Stone, **Shakespeare's Holinshed . . .** 1896) from a section Shakespeare is known to have used as a source when writing **Macbeth**; and this fact "does help to establish the label as genuinely Shakespeare's work." He admits that this section, dealing with "St. Edward's deathbed vision," "does not make the significance of the tree explicit"; but he answers this objection with three points: 1) that Shakespeare would not "have needed more than is in Holinshed;" 2) that "there are . . . good grounds for believing that" Shakespeare "had read . . . Holinshed," 3) and that it "can be neither proved nor disproved" that he "read about St. Edward's vision elsewhere." ("The Prophetic Label in Cymbeline," **Rev. of Eng. Stud.**, N. S. XI, 43 (August 1960), pp. (296)-299.)

Statement required by the act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Acts of March 3, 1933, July 2, 1946 and June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 208) showing the ownership, management, and circulation of **The Shakespeare Newsletter**, published February, April, May, September, November, December, at Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, for November, 1960.

The name and address of the publisher, editor, managing editor and business manager is Louis Marder of Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.

The owner of the publication is the same Louis Marder.

Known bondholders, mortgagees and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are—none.

The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was 1,850.

Louis Marder

Sworn to and subscribed before me, this 11th day of November, 1960, Margaret A. Schmiedl, Notary Public, My commission expires July 23, 1962.

SHAKESPEARE'S BAWDY

Professor Hilda Hulme quotes J. R. Firth's well known dictum: "A word is known by the company it keeps," and she finds that the humble tailor and his yard keep rather bawdy company. Puck (**Midsummer Night's Dream**, II.1.54) describes a typical trick played upon "the wisest aunt (whore?)":

(1) Then slip I from her bum, downe topples she,
And tai'our cries, and fals into a coffe.
And then the whole quire hold their hips, and laffe.

Don Armado (L.L.L.V. 2. 676) as the Worthy Hercules addresses the Princess of France:

(2) Arm. I do adore thy sweet Grace's slipper.
Boyet. (aside to Dumain) loves her by the foot.
Dum. (aside to Boyet) He may not by the yard.

Capulet's servant cannot read his list (**R.J.**, 1.2.38) and talks of fit occupations:

(3) Find them out whose names are written here? It is written that the shoemaker should meddle with his yard and the tailor with his last.

Stephano sings of how Kate (**Temp. II.21.55**)

(4) Would cry to a Sailor goe hang,
She lou'd not the sauor of Tar nor of pitch,
Yet a Tailor might scratch her where'er she did itch.

In **2 IV**, III.2.161) Shallow inquires of Feeble

(5) Shallow. What trade art thou Feeble?
Feeble. A Womans Taylor sir.
Shallow. Shall I prick him, sir?
Falstaff. You may:
But if he had beene a man's Taylor, he would have prick'd you. **SNL.**

Rowe, Pope, Theobald have various emendations for "And tailour cries" in quote 1, a typical emendation being 'taillard' the word for thief. Professor Hulme finds Puck's "aunt" is actually crying out a common pun for 'penis' or 'vagina' and makes a good case for her interpretation. Her method is to study the use of these words elsewhere in Shakespeare, paying close attention to contextual backgrounds. Thus, in quote 2 Dumain means 'penis' for 'yard'. In quote 3 Professor finds the shoemaker meddling with an innocent enough tailor's 'yard', but in quote 4 and 5 the **penis** or **vagina** sense of tailor is quite obviously meant. The phrase **to do a bit of tailoring** meant 'to get with child' (J. S. Farmer, **Dictionary of Slang** (1904).

Professor Hulme does a similar interpretation of the puzzling 'brakes of Ice' speech of Escalus who in vain begs Angelo for Claudio's life (M for M II:1:39):

Well: heauen forgiue him, and forgive us all.
Some rise by sinne, and some by vertue fall:
Some run from brakes of Ice, and answere none,
And some condemned for a fault alone.

Here 'brake' can mean a break in ice, a dangerous crack or gap in ice. 'Fault' commonly meant "a small flaw or crack as in **King John**, IV.2.33:

When workmen strive to do better than well,
They do confound their skill in covetousness;
And oftentimes excusing of a fault
Doth make the fault the worse by the excuse,
As patches set upon a little breach.

But 'fault' can also mean a mistake, sin, misdeed, or an "act of intercourse" as in Kent's comment to Gloucester (**King Lear**, I. 1.16): "I cannot wish the fault undone, the issue of it being so proper" and also in M.W.W. (V.5.9):

Falstaff. Remember loue, Thou wasn't a Bull for thy **Europa** . . . a Swan, for the loue of **Leda** . . . a fault done first in the forme of a beast, (O Love, a beastly fault:).

Thus "brakes of Ice" shows Shakespeare's "economy of comment" in his characterization by means of dramatic imagery. In this special instance Professor Hulme indicates that the image of running from "brakes of ice" can also have sexual significances quite in accord with the context.

("Three Notes: **Troilus and Cressida**, V.7. 11; **Midsummer Night's Dream**, II.1.54; **Measure for Measure**, II.1.39; **Journal of English and Germanic Philology**, LVII:4 (October 1958) pp. 721-725.)

REVIEW OF PERIODICALS

THREE CHOICES IN HAMLET

It is the thesis of O. B. Hardison, Jr., of The University of North Carolina, that the dramatic triad permits in **Hamlet** "a remarkable fusion of inner and outer drama." After a discussion of instances of the triad, a commonplace in literature, and of its salient features—" (1) The main character stands between two subsidiary characters; (2) The triad objectifies the inner condition of the main character; (3) In the humanistic form of the triad the subsidiary characters objectify extremes which are also vices; the main character objectifies a mean which is also a virtue; (4) The humanistic version of the triad operates by contrasts and is essentially static; the main character must avoid the extremes rather than choose them"—the author examines the dramatic foils in **Hamlet** accordingly. The first alternative, suicide, is objectified by Ophelia; the second, revenge, by Laertes; the third, forbearance, by Hamlet-Fortinbras. Since both suicide and revenge involve the danger of damnation, Hamlet, beginning in a position of virtue and although in an "agonizing stasis," must void the extremes. "Since Hamlet's need is to avoid choice, the climax is neither a choice nor an action resulting from choice. It is the moment in the play when Hamlet reconciles himself to the Christian principles which he has, in fact, observed during most of the drama. This point is reached in the speech on the fall of the sparrow. In accepting providence, Hamlet does more than resign himself to the inevitable. He is freed at last from the burden of self-doubt. . . and of action. Forbearance need not be either cowardice or rationalization, and the performance of final justice is no longer dependent on a single frail human being." Thus, as Greek tragedy drew its materials from early Greek religion, so "Shakespeare's **Hamlet** preserves a vital relationship to Christian drama through its exploitation of the dramatic triad." ("The Dramatic Triad in **Hamlet**," **Studies in Philology**, LVII: 2 (April 1960), 144-164.)

LADY MACBETH'S COMPLEXES

Professor Gordon Ross Smith indignantly replies to Professor Holland's attack on the psychological critic (see "Realism and the Psychological Critic; or, How Many Complexes Had Lady Macbeth?" **Literature and Psychology**, X:1 (Winter 1960), pp. 5-8.), and see also Holland's "Authoritarian Patterns in Shakespeare's **Coriolanus**," **Literature and Psychology**, IX: 3,4 (Summer and Fall ,1959), pp. 45-55. Abstract in SNL, IX:6 (Dec. 1959), p.3.

To Professor Holland's statement that dramatic creations ought not to be psychologized as if they were living beings, Dr. Smith retorts that nevertheless a play is an incomplete work of art "like the score of a symphony" and is not complete until it is performed. Hence, a consistent psychological interpretation can give conductor or director "a central and informing conception" of the work. It must be remembered that a play director obtains little help from the script, especially in ambiguous passages where signals such as "forte" and "adagio" are missing. The director of a Shakespearean play provided with a psychological interpretation can often stage a production that will be alive and meaningful to the audience. "Serious art is and must be concerned with aspects of human existence" and not primarily be "occupied with stage conventions, formulas, or idea-systems." ("Professor Smith's reply to Professor Holland," **Literature and Psychology**, X:1 (Winter 1960), pp. 5-8.)

MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM

According to Sheldon P. Zitner of Grinnell College, Samuel Pepys' dictum, that **A Midsummer Night's Dream** is "the most ridiculous insipid play" he had ever seen, suggests that "the play in which Shakespeare reaches maturity as a comic artist is a play not only for all time, but a play for an age . . . .(that) the strength of the dramatic form is balanced by the strength of its relation to an era." Possessing what is perhaps Shakespeare's largest universe, it has been found by some—Hazelton Spencer, for example—to lack "solid underpinning." Yet, it is the author's contention, solidity exists in the firm management of the multiple worlds of the play. These worlds—of power, of love, of work, of faery, of illusion—have a common principle of development: "each grows as an inversion of its serious literary possibilities." Thus **"A Midsummer Night's Dream** is the purest of comedies because, rather than unravelling 'serious' complications, it simply refuses to tie knots." For example, "the invisible world . . . is neither the invisible world of popular belief, nor the invisible world of the other plays . . . .The savage mutability of the invisible world has been replaced by Titania's whimsical pique, and its awful power by Oberon's mere mischief." Similarly, Bottom's play is almost wholly entertainment; reversing the usual logic of Shakspeare's use of the theatre-on-stage, it is "less concentrated, less symbolic, than the life around it." In short, the many worlds develop with respect to motifs which they avoid.

And the tenuousness of their relations to one another may be a virtue rather than, as is commonly held, a failing. The "insistence on the freedom to play—which determines both the pattern of avoidance within the several worlds and the looseness with which they are related—suggests the attractiveness of the comedy to its generation . . . . To its first patrons **A Midsummer Night's Dream** must have seemed an exorcism of their distress. It treated the contagion and bad weather of the middecade, which had impoverished the land, not as an ominous divine judgment, but as fairy spite. It exorcised a lengthening war and deepening social frictions through summoning up enemies wed and social classes delightening in one another. It made for a moment flesh what the Privy Council could only hope for: the revival of a 'housekeeping' gentry, artisans at leisure, traditional loyalties, and traditional pleasures." This drama of avoidance, the author concludes, provided an easy access "to the good old disappearing ways." (The Worlds of **A Midsummer Night's Dream**," **The South Atlantic Quarterly**, LIX:3 (Summer 1960), 397-403.)

TV NOT FOR SHAKESPEARE

The second article of Martin Mayer's series covering the 1959-60 television season, evaluates the plays and prospects. He finds last season's Hallmark production of **The Tempest** no triumph. George Schafer, the producer and director, relied too heavily on "electronic gadgetry . . . for showing Ariel as a real sprite." The enchanted island was too Victorian, the the music mock-Mendelssohn. "Maurice Evans' Prospero was, inevitably, Mr. Evans." Richard Burton's fine performance of Caliban, however, redeemed much of what was wrong with the performance. Mr. Mayer thinks that, on the whole, the play was well cut. "The worst problem in 'The Tempest' was the staging of the comedy scenes, which were written with audience participation in mind." As yet Shakespeare cannot be done successfully on television because "the existing techniques for adaptation will not carry the weight which a play puts on them." ("How Good Is TV at Its Best?" **Harper's** CCXXI: 1324 (September 1960), 85-90.)

REVIEW OF PERIODICALS

A "LOST" SHAKESPEARE POEM?

A convincing, exhaustive, and stimulating study of Shakespeare's sonnets by Professor Brents Stirling of the University of Washington suggests that 100-101, 63-68, 19, 21, and 105, so arranged, represent a " 'lost' Shakespeare poem."

Professor Stirling first deals with the sonnets already in sequence in Thorpe's 1609 Quarto, 63-68, noting 1) that throughout "reference to Shakespeare's friend . . . is in the third person," the sequence being unique in this respect; and 2) that all contain the "uniform epithet 'my love.' " Moreover, 3) "63-68 are already together in the 1609 Quarto where their impersonal address, common epithet, thematic unity, and phrasal linkage show that Shakespeare wrote a series of at least six sonnets" suggesting "a planned group unified both in form and subject matter."

In extending the plan of this sequence Professor Stirling notes 4) that when the five additional sonnets are joined with the initial group "they assert and amplify its themes and ideas, with no extraneous matter" (and he prints the eleven in his proposed order with clear notes and textual analysis); 5) that "the separated sonnets show connectives of image and phrase . . . both with 63-68 and with one another"; 6) that "adding 100-101 and 105 brings to the whole group . . . a conventionally formal structure"; 7) that "all of the five isolated sonnets raise serious questions of relevancy and continuity in their Quarto arrangement"; and 8) that "the removal of 100 and 101 from their Quarto position appears to restore a fragmented group," namely 97-104, which he finds "a better sonnet group than the series of eleven which is our object of study"!

He concludes that if we "control our intuitions by multiple criteria designed to minimize coincidence" (as he has attempted to do by establishing the "eight related but nonredundant factors" of his proof), there is "still responsible work to be done" in revising Thorpe's arrangement. ("A Shakespeare Sonnet Group," PMLA, LXXV, 4, Pt. (September 1960), 340-349.)

CLAUDIUS: A MAN OF CONSCIENCE?

John M. Major of the University of Colorado does not see Claudius as a conscienceless villain, nor does he see him as the consummate hypocrite. On the contrary, evidence in the play shows him to be a "man of conscience" deciding on Hamlet's murder only after the Mousetrap play, a decision taken only after Claudius fears for his own life.

All critics except Howard Mumford Jones in The King in Hamlet (1918) agree that the murder of Hamlet was in Claudius' mind before the murder of Polonius takes place. Jones however did not cite adequate evidence to support his thesis. Profesor Major by a close examination of such things as timing, letters mandate and commission (commission-ambassadorial credentials; mandate—"power of attorney"), and the prayer scene (III.3) claims that Claudius has been unfairly treated by many critics who "assume that he wrote Hamlet's death warrant before the prayer scene." Claudius' prayer is a soliloquy, and nowhere in it does he announce his intention to murder Hamlet, thus violating a powerful stage convention if Claudius did so intend. Iago, Edmund, Lady Macbeth etc. all announce their murderous intents in soliloquy. It is only when Hamlet slaps Polonius and stages the Mousetrap does an essentially conscience-struck Claudius send Hamlet off with the murder mandate. ("The 'Letters Seal'd' in Hamlet and the Character of Claudius," Journal of English and Germanic Philology, LVII:3 (July 1958), 512-521.)

GLUTTONY, LECHERY AND SLOTH

Mark Antony was too much subject to a trio of intimately related vices known as 'Pleasure' but known separately as Gluttony-Lechery-Sloth. A contemporary audience, says Professor J. Leeds Barroll of the University of Texas, would have seen Antony as a figure gradually "brought to nothing through his own vices." Elizabethan accounts of Roman history, moral tracts, dictionaries etc. often castigate Antony and Cleopatra for gluttony as well as other vices. Over eating (gluttony) has "long been regarded as a cause of lechery" and always comes before it as in Chaucer, Langland, De-Guileville etc. This same order was also true of Shakespeare's day. Indeed, certain foods, especially potatoes, were considered aphrodisiacal (see F. M. Dickey, Not Wisely But Too Well (San Marino, 1957), p. 186 and n. 6).

Plutarch mentions Antony's love of feasting and Shakespeare expands on this theme. Antony constantly feasts and banquets. "Gluttony led to lust, and, therefore could symbolize lust." Morality plays show Lust and Gluttony often joined by Sloth, the traditional fleshly sins. Sloth especially had the reputation of being the cause of all sin, either brought on by Lechery and Gluttony or followed by them. A "paralysis of the intellect" went hand-in-hand with the fleshly vices. Reason goes awry and "worldly inactivity" results. Elizabethans other than Shakespeare also showed the slothful Antony careless of duty, steeped in "Lethe'd dulnes' as Shakespeare puts it. Sloth makes Antony "incapable of dealing with his affairs," an idea occuring throughout the play. Antony's sensual indulgence, subverted judgment (a result of Sloth), and neglected duty reduce the once great man to one "who cannot even take his own life properly." (Antony and Pleasure," Journal of English and Germanic Philology, LVII: 4 (October 1958), pp. 798-720.)

CONSOLATIO FOR EXILE

According to John L. Tison, Jr., of the University of Georgia, in one third of Shakespeare's plays exile by decree leads to serious adversity. The tradional consolatio for exile as a genre appeared in numerous Tudor comfort books, but in drama before Shakespeare there were few examples and no formulas for using the consolatio. Shakespeare was free to choose forms, ideas, techniques for the individual situation and individual character, at the same time being influenced by philosophy (consolatory ideas) and rhetoric (psychology of comfort) basic to the genre. Structurally Shakespeare used four elements in exile scenes: decree, reaction to exile, consolation of comforter, and response. In RII decree of exile, lament of sufferer, ideas of consolation are in terms of change of place adapted to the theme of patriotism and the spirit of nationalism. With patriotism AYLI combines the comfort of pastoralism. Both Roman fortitude and courage and Christian sentiment and tenderness occur in the response to banishment in Cor. Res Publica is the main concern in Bolingbroke's response, and desperation is the response of Romeo, who revokes from the Friar a rhetorical comfort (evidentia being his principal figure) when the philosophy of comfort fails. For the exiles in Shakespeare, two evils are paramount: separation from loved ones and separation from homeland. To the doctrine of place and Stoicism of the ancients, to Stoic reason and Christian faith as solace Shakespeare adds patriotism. He has handled "the matter and manner of the consolation genre so artistically that it has become, by nature, drama." ("Shakespeare's Consolatio for Exile," Modern Language Quarterly, XXXI: 2 (June 1960), 142-157.)

THE UGLY WORLD OF RICHARD III

Professor Murray Krieger, Visiting Lecturer in English at the University of Illinois, author of The Tragic Vision and co-editor of The Problems of Aesthetics, believes that Richard III is not the Marlovian tragedy it has been called, even admitting Shakespeare's treatment of the formula. All England is foul. Richard is a fox among foxes. He couples political power with sexual assertion of manliness, and his will to political power is not just a substitution for it, but a perversion of it. Villainy pervades the stage. Other characters know that Richard is a villain, are not "taken in" by him, but engage in deception themselves: the group of citizens (II.iii.27), the scrivaner (III.-vi.10-14), Richard's first victim ("false, fleeting, perjur'd Clarence"), Ann accepting for self-interest seeing Richard's rising star, Elizabeth as politician receiving Richard's addresses to her daughter. Though some characters have moral pretensions in the play, the world of Richard III is ugly. There is some comedy in the play, however: low comedy of the murderers, the discourse on conscience, the wit of Richard. Shakespeare's version of history from the fall of Richard II to the coming of the Tudors holds the answer about the moral atmosphere of Richard III. The theme is usurpation. In Richard III is the blood bath that cleanses the land of guilt-ridden generations. The bloody England may begin anew with Henry Tudor, symbol of conciliation. Foul England is reformed from outside—with its feuds so unqualifiedly ugly. ("The Dark Generation of Richard III," Criticism, I:1 (Winter 1959), 32-49.)

the international

GUIDE

An annual reference to world Little Magazines, literary and art quarterlies and small art presses for use by WRITERS, POETS, TEACHERS, STUDENTS, LIBRARIANS and LITTLE MAGAZINE READERS.

The listing contains detailed data such as editorial policy; purpose; content; manuscript requirements and payment for such; cost per copy; printing method, address; and other important information.

Articles to be featured are as follows: An Objective Look at the Arts of the USA by Curtis Zahn, Calif.; Bri ish writing and little reviews by Denys Val Baker, London; Italian Trends and Literary Magazines by Olga Ragusa; The Writers' Union of the USSR by a Moscow member; Israeli Little Magazines and writing trends by Gabriel Mokad, Tel Aviv; and more . . .

A supplement to the I. G. listing can be found in TRACE, P.O. Box 1068, Hollywood 28, Calif. $2.00 per year, published 5 times yearly.

1961 $2.25 per copy - approx. 200 pages 5½x8½ in. letterpress format

P. O. Box 46066
Los Angeles 46, California

(Copies of the 1960 I.G. are available at $1 plus 10c postage)

REVIEW OF PERIODICALS

Editors: Barbara Alden, Brooklyn College; Gordon E. Beck, Univ. of Kansas; Laurence A. Cummings, Yankton College; William C. McAvoy, St. Louis University; Marvin Spevack, City College (N. Y.); Joseph H. Summerell, N. Y. State University, Plattsburg; Unicio Jack Violi, Fairleigh-Dickenson College.

AARON TRUE TO HIMSELF?

Professor Gordon Ross Smith of Pennsylvania State University finds that Aaron the Moor is "a character, who, however bizarre, still stands up, wobbingly erect from some kind of truth in him." Aaron was genuinely true to his blackness and "accepted himself for what he was," an attitude Professor Smith finds "mentally healthy" even though Aaron's actions are evil.

The famous European criminologist Hans Brennecke in his **Criminal Behavior** (Walter Reckless, pp. 212-213) points to such a type as the Moor; a criminal; a cold, unfeeling murderer who, nevertheless, showed remorse and confessed to his crimes when he had a child of his own. So too Aaron, with his "infinite capacity for senseless evil doing" cuddles, protects, and loves his own black infant (**Titus Andronicus**, IV. 2. 52 ff.). This strange, dichotomous behaviour is accounted for by Professor Smith as being the consequence of social pressure: since evil, fiend, and devil were associated in the popular mind with blackness, Aaron could readily see that "black and bad were what he was." The author defends his literary psychologizing by stating that real character is a mystery at all times, whether living or dramatic; we form ideas about such people even though these ideas can not possibly probe to the heart of any character. Hence, the process of psychology is legitimate for both artistic and real people. ("The Credibility of Aaron," **Literature and Psychology**, X:1 (Winter 1960), pp 11-13.)

"DOUBLE HEN'D SPARROW"

The First Folio reading "double hen'd sparrow (**T.&C.** V. 7.2) is the original and correct one says Professor Hilda M. Hulme. The expression is from Thersites' egging on of cuckold and cuckold maker while in combat, Menelaus vs. Paris:

now bull, now dogge, lowe; Paris lowe; now
my doubled hen'd sparrow; lowe Paris, lowe.
The bull has the game: ware hornes No?

Professor Alexander (following Kellner) emends "double horn'd"; Sisson sees the First Folio's "sparrow" as an editorial emendation. Detailed study of variants finds the Folio correct and to be preferred "Sparrows of high vigor do keep two nests"; they were proverbially lecherous. Praise was truly a 'double-henned sparrow' since he was the husband of both Oenone and Helen, "an appropriate gibe to encourage one not vigoruos enough in battle." (Three Notes: **Troilus and Cressida**, V. vii, 11; **Midsummer Night's Dream**, II. 1. 54; **Measure for Measure**, II. 1. 39, **Journal of English and Germanic Philology**, LVII, 4 (October 1958,), 721-725.)

CURRENCY OF SHAKESPEARE METAPHOR

Understanding of Shakespeare metaphor is basic to understanding George Lemming's **The Pleasure of Exile** (Michael Joseph, 1960). A large part of the world's population is in exile, with exiled writers becoming expert in "the international situation" as it exists in the "backward" countries and becoming teachers and moralists of change. In his review, "The Heritage and Decline of Prospero," V. S. Pritchett interprets the similitude: "For, to use the metaphor he has taken from **The Tempest**, Caliban has now learned the language of Prospero and even his magic, and Prospero himself is an exile in the island he took from his salve. It will not be enough in the countries of Africa for Prospero to be the teacher and servant; both parties must shed the elaborate clothing of colonialism and Prospero must become a citizen." (Rev. of **The Pleasures of Exile**, "The Heritage and Decline of Prospero," **New Statesman**, 30 July 1960, pp. 162-163.)

The Complete Works Of Shakespeare

By Hardin Craig

This text includes all the plays, sonnets, and poems of Shakespeare and offers a complete coverage of his life and times.

Illustrated, 1375 pages $9.00 list

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

Chicago Atlanta Dallas Palo Alto
Fair Lawn, N. J.

SHAKESPEARE'S EFFIGY

The Editor is very desirous of locating all the known full-sized replicas of Shakespeare's Monumental Effigy in Holy Trinity Church, Stratford-upon-Avon.

Any clues or information will be gratefully acknowledged.

FENTON A SOURCE FOR OTHELLO?

Dr. Paul N. Siegel of Long Island University, finding four points of similarity between **Othello** and a story of Geoffry Fenton's **Certaine Tragicall Discourses** (1567) argues from "their conjunction in a story of a military commander of foreign birth who slays his innocent wife out of jealousy" that "Shakespeare had it in mind" when he wrote his play. "Although," Dr. Siegel admits, "in its general outlines this story is not much like **Othello**," the points of resemblance in it are "not to be found," he observes, "in Shakespeare's main source." "First, the heroine . . . is indeed like Desdemona in her rare Griselda-like patience." Second, the husband kisses his wife, Judas-like, before he slays her, as does Othello. Third, the wife's dying confession is cut short by her murder, as is Desdemona's. And fourth, "Fenton's Albanian captain, unlike Cintho's Moor, commits suicide." ("A New Source for **Othello**?" **PMLA**, LXVV, 4, Pt. 1 (September 1960), p. 480.)

BOTTOM'S WONDER

Professor T. M. Pearce of the University of New Mexico, reconsidering Halliwell- Phillip's annotation of Bottom's series of humorous paradoxes (**M N D**.IV.i.214-215), shows how Bottom's wonder upon recalling his enchantment in the Athenian woods is made more profound by Shakespeare's echo of St. Paul, rather than by such chop-logic as found in comedies like **Selinus** and **Wily Beguil'd**. Shakespeare parodied Scripture: "But it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." (I Cor. ii.9). The image is confused in Bottom's lines, "but his observation is essentially that of the Apostle Paul, who asks, 'For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.' (I Cor. ii.11)." ("Shakespeare's **A Midsummer Night's Dream**, I, i, 214-215," **The Explicator**, XVIII:I (Oct. 1959), No. 8.)

LADY MACBETH COMPLEXES

Professor Norman N. Holland of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology states that literary characters should not be treated as people since "fictional character is, after all, only a tissue of words; a dramatic character at his liveliest is only an actor's interpretation of a series of words." The behaviour of dramatic characters is determined by a play's structure and hence follows its logic, not the psychological logic of life but the logic of art. Iago, for example. does what he does as a result of the play's structure and not because he follows "real human emotions or drives." Hamlet is not to be psychoanalyled as if he were a living person. Ernest Jones' **Hamlet and Oedipus** is a typical example of the fallacy. Gordon Ross Smith of Pennsylvania State University in his "Authoritarian Patterns in Shakespeare's **Coriolanus**" (**Lit. and Psych.** IX:3,4 (Summer and Fall, 1959), 45-55) upon which this article is in part a comment also commits the same fallacy. He is not alone: Coriolanus is, like Hamlet, a victim of an Oedipus complex (J. E. Towne); Coriolanus is a phallic-narcissistic type (C. K. Hofling). They cite ample evidence to sustain their theories but they are on the wrong track. Coriolanus is not a human being but a literary character who should be considered as part of the organic unity of the entire play. "There is absolutely no justification for bringing psychology into literary criticism" except to establish a relationship between the work of art and some mind such as the author's or the audience's. "We must, in short, beware questions like, How many complexes had Lady Macbeth?" ("Realism and the Psychological Critic; or, How Many Complexes Had Lady Macbeth?" **Lit. and Psych.**, X:1 (Winter 1960) 5-8.)